EXHIBIT 2

Pages 1 - 26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES DONATO, JUDGE

IN RE: CAPACITORS ANTITRUST) No. C 14-3264 JD
LITIGATION.) San Francisco, California April 21, 2022
IN RE CAPACITORS ANTITRUST LITIGATION (NO. III).))) No. 17-md-2801 JD _)
THE AASI BENEFICIARIES' TRUST, BY AND THROUGH KENNETH A. WELT, LIQUIDATING TRUSTEE,)))
Plaintiff,)
vs.) No. C 17-3472 JD
AVX CORPORATION, et al.,)
Defendants.)))
AVNET, INCORPORATED,))
Plaintiff,)
vs.) No. C 17-7046 JD
HITACHI CHEMICAL COMPANY, LIMITED, et al.,)))
Defendants.)

(CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Transcribed by: Katherine Sullivan, CSR No. 5812, RMR, CRR

```
1
     BENCHMARK ELECTRONICS
     INCORPORATED, et al.,
 2
                 Plaintiffs,
 3
                                          No. C 17-7047 JD
      vs.
 4
     AVX CORPORATION, et al.,
 5
                 Defendants.
 6
 7
     ARROW ELECTRONICS, INCORPORATED, )
     et al.,
 8
                 Plaintiffs,
 9
                                           No. C 18-2657 JD
      vs.
10
     ELNA CO., LTD., et al.,
11
                 Defendants.
12
     JACO ELECTRONICS, INCORPORATED,
13
     et al.,
14
                 Plaintiffs,
15
                                           No. C 19-1902 JD
      VS.
16
     NIPPON CHEMI-CON CORPORATION,
17
     et al.,
                 Defendants.
18
19
20
     APPEARANCES:
21
     For Plaintiff Flextronics Electric Group, Ltd., et al.:
                               BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP
22
                               1155 F Street NW, Suite 700
                               Washington, DC 20004
23
                               Washington, DC 20036
                          BY: CHARLES E. TOMPKINS, ESQ.
24
25
               (APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGES)
```

```
APPEARANCES: (continued)
 1
     The Plaintiff AASI Beneficiaries' Trust, Avnet, Benchmark, and
 2
     Jaco:
                              BILZIN SUMBERG BAENA PRICE
 3
                                & AXELROD LLP
                               1450 Brickell Avenue, 23rd Floor
 4
                              Miami, Florida 33131-3456
 5
                         BY:
                              ROBERT WILLIAM TURKEN, ESQ.
                               SCOTT N. WAGNER, ESQ.
 6
     For Plaintiff Arrow Electronics, Inc.:
 7
                              BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
                               401 East Las Olas Blvd., Suite 1200
                               Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
 8
                         BY:
                              STUART H. SINGER, ESQ.
 9
     For Defendants Holy Stone Enterprise Co., Ltd., Milestone
     Global Technology, Inc., Vishay Polytech Co., Ltd.:
10
                              JONES DAY
11
                               555 South Flower Street, 50th Floor
                              Los Angeles, California 90071
                              ERIC P. ENSON, ESQ.
12
                         BY:
13
     For Defendant AVX Corporation:
                              MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY
                               AND POPEO PC
14
                               555 12th St NW, Suite 1100
15
                               Washington, DC 20004
                              ROBERT G. KIDWELL, ESQ.
                         BY:
16
     For Defendants ELNA Co., Ltd. and ELNA America, Inc.:
17
                              WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR
                               2600 El Camino Real, Suite 400
                              Palo Alto, California 94306
18
                         BY: CHRIS JOHNSTONE, ESQ.
19
               (APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
     APPEARANCES: (continued)
     For Defendant Nippon Chemi-con and United Chemi-con.:
 2
                               PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON &
                                GARRISON LLP
 3
                               2001 K STREET, NW
                               Washington, DC 20006-1047
 4
                               JOSEPH J. BIAL, ESQ.
                         BY:
 5
                               LEAH HIBBLER, ESQ.
 6
     For Defendant Shinyei Corporation of America, Inc.:
                               DENTONS US LLP
                               1900 K Street, NW
 7
                               Washington, DC 20006
                               GASPARE J. BONO, ESQ.
 8
                         BY:
     For Defendant Matsuo Electric Co., Ltd.:
 9
                               MORRISON FOERSTER
                               425 Market Street
10
                               San Francisco, California 94105-2482
11
                         BY:
                               BONNIE LAU, ESQ.
     For Defendant Rubycon Corporation and Rubycon America:
12
                               SHEARMAN & STERLING
                               401 9th Street, NW, Suite 800
13
                               Washington, DC 20004-2128
                               TODD M. STENERSON, ESQ.
14
                         BY:
15
     For Defendant Nichicon Corporation and Nichicon America
     Corporation:
16
                               K&L GATES, LLP
                               One SW Columbia Street, Suite 1900
17
                               Portland, Oregon 97258
                          BY: PHILIP S. VAN DER WEELE, ESQ.
18
     For Defendant Soshin Electric Company Limited:
                               BAKERHOSTETLER
19
                               1050 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 1100
                               Washington, DC 20036
20
                               DANYLL W. FOIX, ESQ.
                         BY:
21
     For Defendant Taitsu America, Inc.:
                               BONA LAW PC
22
                               4275 Executive Square, Suite 200
                               La Jolla, California 93037
23
                              KRISTEN HARRIS, ESQ.
                         BY:
24
25
               (APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)
```

Thursday - April 21, 2022

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10:31 a.m.

PROCEEDINGS

---000---Calling Civil 14-3264, In re Capacitors THE CLERK: Antitrust Litigation; Civil 17-3472, the AASI Beneficiaries Trust, by and through Kenneth A. Welt, Liquidating Trustee versus AVX Corporation; Civil 17-7046, Avnet Incorporated versus Hitachi Chemical Company Limited; Civil 17-7047, Benchmark Electronics Incorporated versus AVX Corporation; Multi District Litigation 17-2801, In re Capacitors Antitrust Litigation (No. III); Civil 18-2657, Arrow Electronics, Inc. versus ELNA Co., Ltd.; and Civil 19-1902, Jaco Electronics, Incorporated, et al. versus Nippon Chemi-Con Corporation, et al. MR. TURKEN: Good morning, Your Honor. Robert Turken, for Avnet, Benchmark, and Jaco. MR. WAGNER: Good morning, Your Honor. Scott Wagner on behalf of AASI, Avnet, and Jaco. MR. TOMPKINS: Charles Tompkins, Your Honor, good morning, on behalf of Flextronics. MR. SINGER: Good morning, Your Honor. Stuart Singer on behalf of Arrow Electronics. MR. STENERSON: Good morning, Your Honor.

Stenerson, from Shearman & Sterling, on behalf of Rubycon Corporation and Rubycon America.

3

24

25

MR. BIAL: Good morning, Your Honor. Joseph Bial for 1 defendants Nippon Chemi-con and United Chemi-con. 2 MS. HIBBLER: Good morning, Your Honor. Leah Hibbler for Defendants NCC and UCC. 4 5 MS. LAU: Good morning, Your Honor. Bonnie Lau for Matsuo Electric Company, Ltd. 6 MR. ENSON: Good morning, Your Honor. Eric Enson, 7 with Jones Day, on behalf of the Holy Stone defendants. 8 MR. VAN DER WEELE: Good morning, Your Honor. Phil 9 Van Der Weele, for Nichicon Corporation and Nichicon America 10 11 Corporation. MS. HARRIS: Good morning, Your Honor. Kristen Harris 12 on behalf of Taitsu. 13 MR. BANK: Good morning, Your Honor. Jeffrey Bank on 14 15 behalf of the Hitachi Chemical defendants. 16 MR. BONO: Good morning, Your Honor. Gaspare J. Bono, with Dentons, for the Shinyei defendants. 17 MR. KIDWELL: Good morning, Your Honor. Robert 18 19 Kidwell on behalf of Defendant AVX Corporation. 20 MR. FOIX: Good morning. Danyll Foix on behalf of the 21 Soshin defendants. MR. JOHNSTONE: Good morning. Chris Johnstone for the 22 ELNA defendants. 23

All right. Is there one person who's going to be the

THE COURT: Okay. Is that it?

spokesperson for the defendants?

MR. STENERSON: Your Honor, Todd Stenerson on behalf of Rubycon. I'll be speaking for most of the defendants; although, they may have something to add.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let's do summary judgment first.

Here is the situation. I don't think it will come as any surprise to any of you. I have had these cases in their original form and then in their Multidistrict Litigation form since 2014, the very day I walked into this courtroom as the United States District Judge.

I've lived through two trials, countless Daubert summary judgments, motions to dismiss. I have seen the record in enormous detail. And, as a result of these years of litigation, every defendant in the MDL case, every defendant with, I think, one minor exception, has settled, typically with substantial sums of money, with the direct purchasers and in some cases the indirect purchasers. So every defendant but one or two defaulters, I believe, has paid a lot of money to get out of the case.

There have been, on the criminal side, eight guilty pleas for the criminal aspects of the price-fixing, and one ACPERA participant. So eight guilty pleas plus one ACPERA participant.

There's just no question that this case is not ripe for

summary judgment. Fact disputes are replete in the record. 1 So all the summary judgment motions are denied. 2 And that is the last pretrial act I need to do under the 3 MDL order, which means, because every party has not executed a 4 5 so-called Lexecon waiver, you're going to go back to Arizona. And that's where you're going to go. 6 7 So, who knows, maybe a change of scenery will help the defendants, help you. Hard to say. But my work is done. 8 There's a rather interesting way that the JPML rule is 9 formulated. I have to make a suggestion of remand. I will 10 11 make that suggestion, and you're on your way. So MDL is officially over. Well, not yet. JPML has to 12 13 say yes. Inevitable that it will. 14 Okay. Yeah. MR. TURKEN: Robert Turken. 15 16 There are several Daubert motions or motions to strike, 17 that the plaintiffs have filed, that I still believe are outstanding. 18 I did that in the *Daubert* order already. 19 THE COURT: MR. TURKEN: You did. That was the Daubert motion the 20 21

defendants have filed.

THE COURT: Oh. Okay.

22

23

24

25

MR. TURKEN: I believe there's a motion to exclude a portion of Hitachi expert Mike Williams.

THE COURT: Do you happen to have -- you may not have

Do you happen to have the docket numbers handy? 1 this. The docket is enormous. It's possible I overlooked 2 something. Do you have the docket numbers? 3 MR. TURKEN: So we have a motion directed at 4 5 Nichicon's expert, and that is 625. THE COURT: Docket 625? 6 7 MR. TURKEN: Uh-huh. THE COURT: Okay. 8 MR. TURKEN: Then Hitachi, our motion directed to 9 Hitachi's expert is docket number 630. 10 11 THE COURT: 630. MR. TURKEN: There is another motion directed to 12 Nichicon's expert and the Film defendants' expert, and that is 13 docket number 623. And that's it. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Well --15 MR. TURKEN: Oh, and I think Flex- --16 THE COURT: No, Flextronics is staying. They filed 17 here originally. So no matter what happens, Flextronics' case 18 19 will be set for trial, which we'll talk about in a moment. How do you feel about having -- you're going back to 20 Is that right? Is that where you're going? How do 21 Arizona. 22 you feel about letting the next judge handle these? 23 MR. TURKEN: Your Honor, honestly, our preference would be, as we stated in our papers, that once we're remanded, 24 25 to file a 1404 motion and, with the Court's blessing, come back

here for trial. 1 You'll file that in Arizona. 2 THE COURT: MR. TURKEN: Yes, of course. One of our clients, 3 AASI, is here. 4 5 THE COURT: In this District? MR. TURKEN: In this District. And it will be part of 6 7 this Court's trial. And, from our purposes, the efficiency advantages of having this Court try the case just overwhelm 8 everything else. 9 THE COURT: I don't disagree with that, but it's up to 10 11 the --MR. TURKEN: Obviously. 12 13 THE COURT: -- Arizona judge to decide. And here's the situation. Our case filings are up 14 25 percent now. In this District last year, just last year, up 15 16 25 percent while everybody was supposedly at home. They were 17 at home drafting complaints. So it's up 25 percent which in our District is a couple thousand cases. 18 We're down five judges. We're down five active judges, so 19 my case load has exponentially burgeoned. Now, it's not just a 20 tale of woe I'm sharing with you. I'm just saying I don't know 21 22 when I can do three more Daubert motions in this case. Ιt 23 could be months. Now, if we were going to go to trial, I would set you for 24 June or July. The trial I can do. I'm ready to go on trial. 25

I mean, there's no problem. There would be no delay whatso---everything I just said about increasing means nothing for my trial calendar because that comes first. And had you stayed here, I probably would have set you for trial in June or July of this year, okay. In other words, a couple of months from now.

The *Dauberts* are a different issue because it's just a different track, and I have a lot of things I have to get done, other trials, for example, that need to get done before I can get back to these *Dauberts*.

I mean, it could be a good long time. I'm just saying, it could be 60, 90 days before I get to these. It could be earlier. I don't know. But I don't want to hold things up.

MR. TURKEN: Understood.

THE COURT: I can't get these done in the next month.

MR. TURKEN: These aren't typical Daubert motions. For instance, with a couple of the motions we would say the Court has already ruled on the main issue.

THE COURT: Oh.

MR. TURKEN: By way of example, our motion against

Hitachi's expert, Dr. Williams, is that it was improper for him

to -- for Hitachi to use him to introduce the Department of

Justice statements --

THE COURT: Oh, I see.

MR. TURKEN: -- here.

And Your Honor already ruled on that in the motions in1 limine. 2 THE COURT: I did. 3 MR. TURKEN: So that one would take care of that 4 5 aspect. The other issues that are addressed in the Daubert motions 6 are -- again, are very, very simple. It's possible we could 7 actually defer them until the motions in limine stage because 8 they're really not the typical Daubert issue. 9 Okay. So one is excluding the DOJ data 10 THE COURT: 11 and then things along those lines? MR. TURKEN: Yes, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: It's not like what we did at the 13 (inaudible). 14 15 MR. TURKEN: No, Your Honor. Absolutely not. 16 THE COURT: All right. Okay. Well, maybe I can do 17 I'll look, okay. it. 18 I just want to be clear, the trial will not be an issue. 19 We are prioritizing trials. I've done three, including the 20 last DPP trial for the MDL just a couple months ago in 21 December. So I can get you in on trial soon. That's not a holdup for me. 22 But on just these other things, you know, there's just a 23 big backlog. So I'll do what I can, okay. If it turns out --24 25 I will look at it. And if it turns out I can't get to them, is

```
the default you would sort of reserve them for motion in
 1
     limine?
 2
              MR. TURKEN: I think so, Your Honor. That probably
 3
     would be --
 4
 5
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
              MR. TURKEN: That probably --
 6
                          If it comes back to me, I promise I won't
 7
              THE COURT:
    have a problem with that. We'll make a deal. I'll take them
 8
 9
    up.
              MR. TURKEN: That's fair enough.
10
                         Okay. Defendants?
11
              THE COURT:
              MR. VAN DER WEELE: I was going to say --
12
13
              THE CLERK:
                         I'm sorry.
              THE COURT: Sorry, we're doing this recording thing.
14
15
     You have to say your name.
16
              MR. VAN DER WEELE: Okay. Phil Van Der Weele on
17
    behalf of the Nichicon defendants.
18
          At least with respect to the Dauberts that are directed
19
     toward Nichicon, I agree with Mr. Turken, they are not your
20
     typical Dauberts. They're more like hearsay objections.
21
              THE COURT: Oh, okay. They are motions in limine kind
     of vein.
22
23
              MR. VAN DER WEELE: Yes, Your Honor. At least with
     respect to the ones directed to Nichicon.
24
25
              THE COURT: But you would agree you'd have no problem
```

dealing with them in the motion in limine stage? 1 MR. VAN DER WEELE: That is correct, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Okay. And who's the other one? 3 MR. BANK: Your Honor, Jeffrey Bank for Hitachi. Same 4 5 We're fine dealing with them at the motions in limine thing. 6 stage. If the cases remain in Arizona, that judge can deal with them. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I might do that. 8 answer them. We'll see. But, yeah. 9 MR. STENERSON: Todd Stenerson, Your Honor. We agree 10 11 with Your Honor's reading of Lexecon and the remand of the Avnet, Benchmark, and Jaco cases to Arizona. 12 13 I did want to mention briefly, the AASI case, though, that counsel mentioned, that is in front of Your Honor, I don't say 14 15 this very often, but I don't think that case should be going to 16 trial. The single damages in that case is \$744,000 total. THE COURT: Is that right? 17 MR. STENERSON: 18 Yes. THE COURT: Before trebling though? 19 MR. STENERSON: Before treble. So after trebling is 20 \$2.2 million. 21 Really? 22 THE COURT: MR. STENERSON: And we would ask that the Court send 23 that case to the mediation here in this District to see if we 24 25 can resolve it.

```
Is that right? Home run would be about
 1
              THE COURT:
     2.1 million?
 2
              MR. TURKEN: Robert Turken. That is correct, Your
 3
 4
     Honor.
 5
          In fact, if we are not able to have our Arizona cases
     transferred back here, then we likely would either adopt the
 6
     suggestion or ask the Court to transfer to Arizona so AASI
 7
     could be tried together with that case as well.
 8
              THE COURT:
                          Oh.
 9
              MR. TURKEN: We think that the 1404 -- the Section
10
11
     1404 motion that we're contemplating will get us back here.
     And, in that case, then AASI would just go along for the ride.
12
              THE COURT: With Flextronics?
13
              MR. TURKEN: Well, I will let counsel -- I think
14
15
     the --
16
              THE COURT: Let me just tell you, I was going to set
17
     Flextronics for July. You're not going to be ready to go --
18
              MR. TURKEN: I think it's unlikely we'll have our 1404
19
     ruling by July.
20
              THE COURT: How about October?
              MR. TURKEN:
21
                           Yes.
                          Sure?
22
              THE COURT:
23
              MR. TURKEN: No.
24
          (Laughter)
              MR. TURKEN: But think about it from this perspective.
25
```

THE COURT: Let me just jump in. I want you to 1 finish. 2 I don't remember -- do you know who the judge is? 3 remember who he is. 4 5 MR. TURKEN: So the --THE COURT: You don't need to name the judge. Do you 6 know anything about the judge's docket? 7 MR. TURKEN: It's a little complicated because we have 8 three different Arizona judges. 9 THE COURT: Oh. 10 11 MR. TURKEN: The first step is to get it consolidated. That's just a formality. 12 It takes time. 13 THE COURT: MR. TURKEN: So October, I think, is reasonable. 14 July 15 is not reasonable. 16 MR. SINGER: Your Honor, just briefly, Stuart Singer 17 on behalf of Arrow. I just want to note that our case will be 18 going back to the District of Colorado. Oh, really? Colorado. 19 THE COURT: MR. SINGER: And Judge Arquello is the judge. 20 THE COURT: This is not binding on anyone, defendants 21 22 or plaintiffs, and I am not in any way injecting myself into settlement discussions. I mean, this is something you 23 disclosed in your initial disclosures and you can easily update 24 25 that.

```
What do you think your damages, if you hit a home run,
 1
     what would they be before trebling?
 2
              MR. SINGER: Our claim is roughly $90 million before
 3
     trebling.
 4
 5
              THE COURT:
                         90 million just for your client?
              MR. SINGER: Ours is one of the major purchasers.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: Before trebling. Okay. All right.
          Remind me, what is Flextronics' claim before trebling?
 8
              (Inaudible speaker.)
 9
              MR. TOMPKINS: Charles Tompkins for Flextronics.
10
11
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
              MR. TURKEN: And our claims for Avnet, Benchmark, and
12
     Jaco are about 110 million.
13
              THE COURT: Before trebling. Okay. So there's only
14
15
     one case that --
16
              MR. TURKEN: AASI is not a (inaudible).
17
              THE COURT:
                          Got it. All right. Okay.
          Can somebody sum up for me what you would like me to do?
18
              MR. TOMPKINS: Your Honor, Charles Tompkins for
19
20
     Flextronics. I think the parties, potentially, depending on
21
    how this is all resolved, Flextronics' position is we would
     like a near-term trial.
22
23
          And while we have no objection --
              THE COURT: You would like what?
24
              MR. TOMPKINS: A near-term trial --
25
```

1 THE COURT: Near-term, yes, okay. 2 MR. TOMPKINS: A trial date shortly. And while we have no conceptual objection to trying the 3 case with other plaintiffs, we do have an objection with the 4 5 current posture of the case because we have now resolved the case against everyone except for NCC. 6 So NCC -- so our trial is a substantially different beast 7 than a trial that involves the formidable --8 THE COURT: Right. It's just you and NCC. 9 MR. TOMPKINS: Yeah. 10 11 THE COURT: Yeah. MR. TOMPKINS: Including, you know, we do have -- for 12 13 example, we have stipulations with certain defendants' experts not to testify against our experts if joined. We have 14 15 cooperation agreements with some of the defendants. 16 So we're happy to have a joint trial if the cases are 17 resolved in such a way that there aren't these enormous 18 differences between Flex case and the other cases. 19 THE COURT: Can you remind me, Mr. Turken, who are the defendants in your case? 20 MR. TURKEN: We have Hitachi, Nichicon, NCC, and UCC, 21 22 ELNA, Holy Stone, Matsuo. 23 THE COURT: You have the whole slate basically. MR. TURKEN: Pretty much. 24 25 THE COURT: Okay. And the other one, your Colorado

case? 1 MR. TURKEN: AASI has the same roster. 2 THE COURT: Same roster. 3 MR. SINGER: Stuart Singer for Arrow. We are 4 5 somewhere in between the two. We have -- in addition to NCC and UCC, we have ELNA, Soshin, Matsuo, Taitsu, and Shinyei. 6 7 THE COURT: I see. Okay. MR. TOMPKINS: Your Honor, I'm going to note, just 8 because he's listed, one substantive effect of the differences 9 in defendants is that they have a lot of the Film cons- -- the 10 11 alleged Film conspiracy defendants remaining. Not to characterize them as two conspiracies substantively. 12 And that is an aspect of the case that Flextronics 13 presently doesn't intend to prove at trial because we resolved 14 15 the case against all the Film defendants. 16 THE COURT: It may make sense, since Flextronics is really much more focused in terms of defendant and product, it 17 18 might make sense just to have them do their thing. And if 19 Colorado and Arizona come back, maybe you two would do it 20 together. 21 I mean, this is just a concept. Does that sound okay? 22 Let Flextronics qo forward? 23 MR. TOMPKINS: Yes. MR. TURKEN: Stuart and I have worked together for 24 25 years. That would be we perfectly fine.

1 MR. SINGER: Stuart Singer on behalf of Arrow. We are in complete agreement with doing that. 2 THE COURT: All right. 3 MS. HIBBLER: Your Honor, Leah Hibbler --4 5 THE COURT: Yes. MS. HIBBLER: -- on behalf of NCC and UCC. 6 7 Before we get much further into this, could we speak for a few minutes about the scheduling of a Flextronics trial? 8 THE COURT: Sure. 9 MS. HIBBLER: NCC and UCC are not able to have a trial 10 11 this summer because neither of our experts will be available until after August. 12 13 THE COURT: Why is that? MS. HIBBLER: Our expert, Dr. Haider, is fully 14 15 occupied with other trials and preplanned travel throughout 16 July and August. 17 Dr. Israel is fully occupied with preplanned travel throughout June. And then he has trials throughout August as 18 19 well. 20 THE COURT: Well, I mean, cases settle. I'm not really -- the fact that there are other 21 commitments, 99 percent, nine-nine, federal cases, sadly, 22 The statistic from Federal Judicial Center. 23 settle. So I understand what you're saying, but I can't build my 24 25 schedules around the overwhelmingly likely statistical

possibility that the experts will not be in trial in July or August.

So, I mean, it can't be that much you have to do. You just went through this. Your client just went through this in December. Should be largely in the can, as our Hollywood friends say. A little bit of tailoring for Flextronics, but you know the evidence. You've seen it more than once. It's going to be the same evidence as the conspiracy.

Really, the only portion that might be different is

Flextronics will have its own damages claim. But, other than
that, it's largely the same pool of evidence you all tried in
this very courtroom a couple months ago. So --

MR. BIAL: Your Honor, could I make one point?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BIAL: Joseph Bial for UCC and NCC.

Although I don't disagree at all with what Your Honor said about the proof that they're likely to put in on the conspiracy, our defense will be significantly directed toward the foreign purchasers -- purchases, rather, which are considerable for Flextronics. That was not an issue in the DPP trial.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BIAL: It likely, almost certainly, would not be an issue in the other trial for Mr. Turken --

THE COURT: That's not really an expert. You're just

going to have facts showing that the point of purchase --

MR. BIAL: Right. Well, I'm just making the point that I don't think that the trial that we just had in December will overlap in many ways with the trial that -- the defense that we're planning to put on with respect to Flextronics.

MR. TOMPKINS: Charles Tompkins for Flextronics. I don't think the FTI issues represent a significant difference in the case.

There are some differences in the liability evidence because Flextronics was a named target of the conspiracy, unlike the DPPs. But, I think, the cases overlap pretty significantly.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I really would like to get this done in August at the latest. We have a lot of work done already with the motions in limine and the experts and pretrial rulings and so on.

So why don't you get together and think about an August date. Just one defendant this time and one plaintiff.

I don't remember how many hours I gave last time but, you know -- I won't trim it back too much because the issues are still significant, but it won't be the same amount of time. So probably two and a half weeks, three weeks, something like that.

And this time -- did we go 9:00 to 4:00 last time? I don't remember. You would know. Did we do 9:00 to 4:00 last

time? 1 MS. HIBBLER: I think we shot for 9:00 to 4:00, Your 2 Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. I'll probably do 9:00 to 4:00 4 5 I'll regret this, but I'll do 9:00 to 4:00 again and again. have a lunch, which I normally don't do. I normally do 9:00 to 6 7 2:00 with no lunch. But in the interest of concentrating the experience, we might do that. 8 Anyway, why don't you two get together. Think about a 9 date in August, okay. 10 11 I have to have it done, at the latest, by the first week of September, end of the first week of September. Okay. 12 I mean, I'm like LaGuardia. I've got planes stacked up 13 every 500 feet. And you know what happens when one plane gets 14 out of its lane; everybody crashes. So you're going to have to 15 16 help me out here, okay. 17 Now, for you all, see what happens. And come back. to have you. Can certainly fit you in for trial, no problem. 18 I'll take a look at these docket numbers you gave me, 625, 19 623, and 630. If I can knock them out, I will. If not, I 20 might save them for a motion in limine for me or the next 21 22 person, okay. 23 Anything else for today from the plaintiffs? MR. TOMPKINS: No, Your Honor. Not for Flextronics. 24 25 MR. TURKEN: No, Your Honor. Not for our clients

2

6

```
either.
 1
              THE COURT: Okay. Now, I do have to make this
     suggestion. I don't know what happens after that. So I don't
 3
     know if there's some additional time lag as a result of that.
 4
 5
     It's para incognita for me.
              MR. WAGNER: Paul Wagner, Your Honor.
 7
          Once you make the suggestions of remand, the JPML takes it
     from there.
 8
                          I would assume that would be the case.
 9
              THE COURT:
     It's odd because the suggestion rule says an opposition can be
10
11
     if filed, which no sense to me whatsoever.
              MR. WAGNER: I don't think I've ever seen one but --
12
13
              THE COURT: I actually found one. I found one where
     somebody opposed it.
14
15
          Anyway, it should be no problem, but I hope that
16
     doesn't -- the JPML technically does it. I would be happy to
17
     transfer it today, but they have to actually do it. So it will
    be at least a couple of weeks probably.
18
              MR. WAGNER: Thank you, Your Honor.
19
20
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
              MR. STENERSON: Your Honor, just one last thing.
                                                                Todd
21
     Stenerson for the defendants.
22
23
          In case we don't see you again, thank you --
24
              THE COURT:
                          Oh --
25
              MR. STENERSON: -- for your Judge's MDL duties.
```

```
It's been a delight. It's actually been a
 1
              THE COURT:
 2
     very entertaining case. I have new MDLs that will, I think, be
     equally interesting in different ways.
 3
          But, you know, $700 million in settlements to date.
 4
 5
     That's a lot of money. And eight guilty convictions, guilty
     plea convictions. So it was a real case.
 6
 7
          Everybody worked hard on both sides, and particularly
     Mr. Saveri and his firm, who are not here today, but everybody
 8
     did a good job.
 9
          Okay. We'll see what happens. Thanks for coming in.
10
              THE CLERK: All rise. Court is in recess.
11
                  (Proceedings adjourned at 10:57 a.m.)
12
                                ---000---
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 2 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER 3 I, KATHERINE POWELL SULLIVAN, CSR NO. 5812, RMR, CRR, 4 5 certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to the best of my ability, of the above pages of the official 6 electronic sound recording provided to me by the U.S. District 7 Court, Northern District of California, of the proceedings 8 taken on the date and time previously stated in the above 9 10 matter. I further certify that I am neither counsel for, related 11 to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which 12 this hearing was taken; and, further, that I am not financially 13 nor otherwise interested in the outcome of the action. 14 15 16 17 DATE: Saturday, April 23, 2022 18 19 20 21 Katherine Powell Sullivan, Transcriber 22 23 24 25